



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/592,204	06/13/2000	Charu Aneja	RCA 89,652	7412

7590

02/09/2004

Joseph S Tripoli
Patent Operations
Thomson Multimedia Licensing Inc
P O Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

EXAMINER

SINGH, DALIP K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2676

6

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/592,204

Applicant(s)

ANEJA ET AL.

Examiner

Dalip K Singh

Art Unit

2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. This Office Action is in response to applicant's remarks dated November 6, 2003, in response to PTO Office Action dated July 11, 2003. The amendments to claim(s) 1, 12, 15 and 21 have been noted and entered into the record and applicant's remarks have been carefully considered resulting in the action as set forth herein below.
2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but they are not persuasive.
3. With respect to applicant's argument with respect to claim 1 that, "Min et al. teaches away from the applicant's claimed invention by teaching the storage of a single header and a pixel map region in an OSD section of memory", claim 1 as amended recites "storing a pixel map in a memory at a memory location", Min et al. at Fig. 7 **discloses** an OSD memory structure where pixel maps are stored (...and a bitmap area 200...storing color signal data...to be displayed on the screen...col. 7, lines 32-43). Further claim 1 as amended recites "each header containing the memory location of the pixel map and a unique display characteristic", Min et al. at Fig. 7 **discloses** each of the OSD local headers 0-15 in the command area 100 contains a data bitmap position of the OSD regions (...position information of the OSD regions...stored in the bitmap area 200 is contained in the local header information...col. 7, lines 40-53).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim(s) 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,489,947 to Cooper in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,462,746 B1 to Min et al.

a. Regarding claim 1, Cooper **discloses** storing a header associated with the pixel map in the memory (...the graphic image...words are ...stored in OSD section 1513-3 of RAM 1513...in the form of header for the bit map...col. 6, lines 43-46); and selecting a header defining a desired display characteristic for the pixel map (...OSD display unit 1509-9 requests data from OSD section...via memory controller ...as required...col. 6, lines 57-59). However, Cooper **fails to disclose** storing a plurality of different headers. Min et al. **discloses** storing a plurality of different headers in the memory (...an OSD memory structure...comprising...an OSD global header...OSD local headers 0-15...a bitmap area 200 including OSD regions 0-15 storing color signal data...col. 7, lines 33-43, Figure 7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the device as taught by Cooper with the feature “storage of plurality of different headers” as taught by Min et al. **because** it provides flexible support for different degrees of resolution on the same picture screen (col. 4, lines 50-54).

b. Regarding claim 2, Cooper **discloses** processing the selected header and associated pixel map to generate an image in a displayable format (...OSD display unit 1509-9 causes the bit map to be read out...converts the color representative word for each pixel ...from the header...col. 6, lines 53-59).

c. Regarding claim 3, Cooper **discloses** pixel map being associated with an on-screen display (OSD) data structure (...the graphic image...words are ...stored in OSD section 1513-3 of RAM 1513...in the form of header for the bit map...col. 6, lines 43-46).

d. Regarding claim 4, Cooper **discloses** desired display characteristic (video image component representative groups) being as luminance representative word and color difference representative words and **does not disclose** side panel, a YUV or YIQ colorimetry, degree of transparency, an image size, an interlaced or progressive display format, a color scheme, an aspect ratio, a blending ratio, a resolution factor, a number of bits per pixel, a compression factor, a horizontal pixel duplication value, and a vertical pixel duplication value in particular as per the instant claim 4. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the device as taught by Moshenberg with the features "side panel, a YUV or YIQ colorimetry, degree of transparency, an image size, an interlaced or progressive display format, a color scheme, an aspect ratio, a blending ratio, a resolution factor, a number of bits per pixel, a compression factor, a horizontal pixel duplication value, and a vertical pixel duplication value in the headers" as taught by Cooper because it affords a flexible means to control colors of a graphic image depending on the nature of graphics image to be displayed (col. 6, lines 49-52).

e. Regarding claim 5, it is similar in scope to claim 1 above and is rejected under the same rationale.

f. Regarding claim 6, Cooper **discloses** the image is an on-screen display (...the graphic image...are transmitted...in OSD section 1513-3 of RAM 1513...col. 6, lines 44-59).

g. Regarding claim 7, it is similar in scope to claim 4 above and is rejected under the same rationale.

h. Regarding claim 8, Cooper **discloses** for each pixel of the graphic image there is digital word representing a color for that pixel (col. 6, lines 1-24). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the device as taught by Moshenberg with the feature “for the each display characteristic is a unique set of display characteristics” as taught by Cooper because it affords a flexible means to control colors of a graphic image depending on the nature of graphics image to be displayed (col. 6, lines 49-52).

i. Regarding claim 9, Cooper **discloses** storing the data structure in the memory prior to the receipt of the image display request (...the graphic image component...words are ...stored in OSD section 1513-3 of RAM 1513...col. 6, lines 43-52).

j. Regarding claim 10, Cooper **discloses** the image data structure is one of a plurality of image data structures stored in the memory (.....the graphic image component...words are ...stored in OSD section 1513-3 of RAM 1513...col. 6, lines 43-52).

k. Regarding claim 11, Cooper **discloses** the image data in the image block of the image data structure is a pixel map (...stored in OSD section...of RAM 1513...in the form of a header for the bit map...col. 6, lines 43-46).

l. Regarding claim 12, it is similar in scope to claim 5 above and is rejected under the same rationale.

m. Regarding claim 13, it is similar in scope to claim 7 above and is rejected under the same rationale.

n. Regarding claim 14, it is similar in scope to claim 11 above and is rejected under the same rationale.

o. Regarding claim 15, it is similar in scope to claim 12 above and is rejected under the same rationale.

- p. Regarding claim 16, Cooper **discloses** a display unit (Figure 1, Television Receiver) coupled to the processing circuitry for displaying the image generated by the processing circuitry.
- q. Regarding claim 17, it is similar in scope to claim 11 above and is rejected under the same rationale.
- r. Regarding claim 18, it is similar in scope to claim 13 above and is rejected under the same rationale.
- s. Regarding claim 19, it is similar in scope to claim 6 above and is rejected under the same rationale.
- t. Regarding claim 20, it is similar in scope to claim 8 above and is rejected under the same rationale.
- u. Regarding claim 21, Cooper **discloses** an on-screen display memory comprising: a first region containing a pixel map (video ram 1513); a second region containing a plurality of different headers respectively defining different display characteristics for the pixel map (OSD bit map with header 1513-3); and a control port (memory controller 1509-3) for selecting a desired one of the different headers (Figure 2).

Conclusion

6. Applicant's arguments have been considered but they are not persuasive. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2676

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Dalip K. Singh** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-3895**. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu (8:00AM-6:30PM) Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Matthew Bella**, can be reached at **(703) 308-6829**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to: (703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist). Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office at telephone number : (703)-306-0377.

dks

February 5, 2004



MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600